Classical Philology

THE INTERSTATE USE OF THE GREEK DIALECTS

BY CARL DARLING BUCK

Not only in earlier times, but also, in most parts of Greece, long after Attic had become the norm of literary prose, each state employed its own dialect, both in private and public monuments of internal concern, and in those of a more external or interstate character, such as decrees in honor of foreigners, decisions of interstate arbitration, and, in general, communications between different states.

This brief statement of the general situation, which I have given elsewhere and illustrated with some examples,[1] I repeat here by way of introduction to a more detailed consideration, with special reference to peculiar and exceptional cases, of the question of dialect in "interstate" inscriptions. This term is retained, in default of a better, but is to be understood here in the broadest sense, to include, for example, dedications set up away from the home of the dedicator.

There is no doubt as to what is the general practice, namely the use of the native dialect[2] of the authors of inscriptions, regardless of the parties to whom they are addressed, the subject-matter, or the place of publication. But there are some real or apparent exceptions, and such have now and then misled competent epigraphists

---

[1] *Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects*, pp. 154 ff.

[2] Likewise the native type of alphabet. But it is to be remembered that the native alphabets were given up in favor of the Ionic long before most of the dialects were given up in favor of the Attic κοινή.

into unnecessarily vague statements or even directly false assertions as to what is usual.[1]

It is obvious that certain forms of dialect mixture which occur have no bearing on the question before us. The influence of the literary epic, which shows itself in varying degrees in the metrical dedications and epitaphs, is no more common in the inscriptions set up abroad than in those set up at home. Nor is the admixture of Attic forms in the later Doric or other dialects generally any different in the interstate inscriptions from that which the same dialect shows in the inscriptions found within its own territory. It is only the substitution of the Attic κοινή for the local dialect with Attic coloring that would concern us. In the period of fluctuation between Attic and the local dialect the choice of the former may in some given instances be due to the interstate character of a document. But this should not be assumed without weighing the question in each case whether the difference is really between interstate and other documents, or between those of a formal public character, whether interstate or local, and others, as for example in the Nicareta inscription (*IG* VII, 3172), where the formally drawn financial contrast is in Attic, the other portions in Boeotian.

Certain aberrations from the native dialect, in the nature of elimination of some specific local peculiarity, have often been pointed out as due to the interstate character of the inscriptions in which they occur, and no doubt correctly in some instances. Thus Solmsen *KZ* XXXII, 539, speaking of the inscription on the serpent column from Delphi, which is in the Laconian alphabet, but nevertheless has ἐπολέμεον without the regular Laconian change of antevocalic ε to ι, remarks:

Es sollte das nationale geschenk aller Hellenen darstellen, soweit sie sich an den freiheitskämpfen beteiligt hatten, und so ist es nur natürlich, dass die Lakedaemonier, wenn sie die weihinschrift auch in ihrem alphabet eingraben liessen, doch in der sprache die speciellen eigenheiten ihrer mundart ver-

---

[1] Thus Hoffmann *Griech. Dial.* I, p. 17, regards the use of Attic in an Arcadian decree in honor of an Athenian as natural, "weil Ehrendekrete für Angehörige eines fremden Staates schon seit ältester Zeit nicht im einheimischen Dialekte, sondern im Dialekte des Geehrten gehalten zu werden pflegten." This statement can only be understood as a momentary lapse on the part of a scholar who must on reflection be well aware that, whatever the explanation of this particular case, the general practice is precisely the opposite. See below, pp. 145 ff.

mieden und das den meisten dorischen stämmen gemeinsame zu grunde legten; man kann darin einen ansatz zu einer dor. gemeinsprache sehen. Auch Pindar, der für den ganzen hellenischen adel dorischen stämmes dichtete, hat die in rede stehenden besonderheiten des lakonischen und seinen heimatlichen dialekts durchaus vermieden.

Similarly Meister *Dorer und Achäer* I, 9 ff.:

Bei Verwendung dieser von Spartanen verfassten Inschriften für die Erkenntniss des spartanischen Dialekts sind die bekannten Tatsachen in Rechnung zu ziehen, dass in den Texten, die ausserhalb der heimischen Landschaften aufgestellt für andere Greichen und für den internationalen Verkehr bestimmt waren, besonders exzentrische Eigentümlichkeiten des Dialekts wie des Alphabets gewöhnlich unterdrückt zu werden pflegten.

The "gewöhnlich" he qualifies in a footnote by "nicht immer." I have no doubt that such elimination of certain specific peculiarities is to be recognized, but I believe that "occasionally, but not usually," instead of "usually, but not always," would be nearer the mark, and further that this is not entirely confined to interstate inscriptions.[1]

DEDICATIONS

The matter of the dialect employed in dedications has recently been recalled to notice by the Cleobis and Biton dedication at Delphi, apropos of which Premerstein *Oest. Jhrh.* XIII, 48 remarks: "In aller Regel sind die Inschriften archäischer Weihungen im Alphabet und Dialekt der Dedikanten gehalten; doch gibt es Ausnahmen, indem auswärtige Stifter mitunter der ortsüblichen Schrift und Sprache sich bedienen, so z. B. die Söhne des Pariers Charopinos auf ihren delphischen Anathemen."

Examples in plenty of the normal practice, the use of the alphabet and dialect of the dedicators, regardless of where the objects are set up, are furnished by the dedications from all parts of the Greek world found at the Panhellenic sanctuaries of Olympia, Delos, Delphi, and Dodona, as well as at other sites, e.g., a Naxian dedication at Boeotian Orchomenus (*SGDI* 5422; Roberts I, No. 28).

The artist's signatures are likewise normally in the dialect and alphabet of the artist. Yet now and then the artist working abroad may adapt himself to the local practice.

---

[1] See *Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects*, § 275, and the remarks on ναός, below, p. 137, and on Πυθαγόρας, below, p. 138.

In those cases where both dedication and artist's signature belonging to the same work are preserved, and dedicator and artist are not compatriots, we expect and find, as a general rule, the appropriate differentiation. But there are also some instances in which the dedication shows the form appropriate to the artist, indicating that the matter was intrusted to his hands; and others in which, conversely, the artist's signature is adapted to the dedication; and still others in which the local influence of the place of dedication is a third element. Some illustrations of the normal differentiation are given first, followed by examples of adaptation or local influence.

Inschriften von Olympia 271; Loewy *Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer* 33:

  a) [Γλαυκί]αι με Κάλον γενε[αῖ F]αλεῖορ ἐποίε.
  b) [Γλ]αυκίης ὁ Λυκκίδεō [τō]ι Ἑρμῆι Ῥ[η]γῖνος.

The signature of the Elean artist is in the Elean dialect and alphabet; the dedication in the Ionic dialect and in the alphabet then current at Rhegium.

Inschriften von Olympia 143; Loewy 28:

  a) Γέλōν Δεινομένεος Γελôι]ος ἀνέθēκε.
  b) Γλαυκίας Αἰγινάτας ἐ[π]οίε̄σε.

There is nothing here significant for the dialect. But the contrast between Ϻ in the dedication and Ϸ in the artist's signature is not accidental. For that the use of Ϻ was established at both Gela and Syracuse considerably earlier than in many parts of Greece, for example at Athens where it is rare before the middle of the fifth century, we know from other sources, e.g., the coin legends of Gela and Syracuse, the Delphian dedication of Gelon, quoted below, the Olympian dedication of Hieron (*Inschr. von Olympia* 249), and the early inscriptions on the steps of the temple of Apollo at Syracuse (Roberts I, No. 110).

Inschriften von Olympia 162: Loewy 91:

  Of the original inscription, the later restoration of which reads Πυθοκλῆς ᾿Αλεῖος. [Πολύ]κλειτος ἐποίει ᾿Αργεῖος, enough is preserved to show clearly the difference in alphabet, the signature of

the artist showing the characteristic Argive form of lambda, while the dedication shows the usual form current in Elis.

Dedication of Gelon of Syracuse at Delphi: Homolle *BCH* XXI, 589; *Mélanges Weil* 212 ff.; Hicks² 16; Ditt. *Syll.*² 910:

a) Γέλōν ὁ Δεινομέν[εος] | ἀνέθε̄κε τō̄πόλλōνι | Συραφόσιος.

b) Τὸν τρίποδα καὶ τε̄ν νίκε̄ν ἐργάσατο | Βίōν Διοδόρō υἱὸς Μιλέσιος.

The dedication is Syracusan in alphabet and dialect. The article without spiritus asper has already been attested for Syracuse, among other places (cf. my *Greek Dialects*, p. 50), by the Olympian dedication of Hieron, beginning Ηιάρōν ὁ. The artist's signature is in the Ionic dialect (τε̄ν νίκε̄ν) as is natural, but the alphabet is not the Milesian Ionic (note Ε =η, Ο =ω). It cannot be a case of continuation of the alphabet used in the dedication, for it has Ͱ, ⊰ in contrast to C, ⊰ = γ, σ. There seems to be left only one possibility, namely, that the alphabet is Delphian. Yet Delphian inscriptions of about the same date show Γ =γ and ⊰ =σ.

Inschriften von Olympia 259; Loewy 49:

a) Μεσσάνιοι καὶ Ναυπάκτιοι ἀνέθεν Διὶ | Ὀλυμπίωι δεκάταν ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων.

b) Παιώνιος ἐποίησε Μενδαῖος | καὶ τἀκρωτήρια ποιῶν ἐπὶ τὸν ναὸν ἐνίκα.

The alphabet of both *a* and *b* is Ionic. This may be thought of as the use of the artist's alphabet in the dedication as well. But the date of the monument is not long before the Ionic alphabet came into general use. In dialect the dedication and artist's inscription are still distinct, the former in Doric, the latter in Ionic, except for *ναόν*. This use of *ναός* is not due merely to the fact that the particular temple referred to was so called (Dittenberger-Purgold, *loc. cit.*), but is an early example of the tendency to replace the Attic-Ionic *νεώς* by the more cosmopolitan form, which is also observed in dedications from Ionic soil and which results in the establishment of *ναός* in the *κοινή*.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Michel 1209: βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος ἀνέθηκε τὸν ναὸν Ἀθηναίηι Πολιάδι (Priene, 334 B.C.); and Michel 1134: Ξενοκλείδης Πόσιος ἀνέθηκε τὸν ναὸν Ἀρτέμιδι Ἀγρο-τέραι κτλ. (Panagoria, second half of the fourth century.) *ναός* prevails in Attic inscriptions after about 250 B.C. (Meisterhans-Schwyzer 128), and is the Modern Greek form (similarly always λαός).

Inschriften von Olympia 144; Loewy 22:

> Εὔθυμος Λοκρὸς ᾿Αστυκλέος τρὶς ᾿Ολύμπι᾿ ἐνίκων
> εἰκόνα δ᾿ ἔστησεν τήνδε βροτοῖς ἐσορᾶν.
> Εὔθυμος Λοκρὸς ἀπὸ Ζεφυρίου ἀνέθηκε.
> Πυθαγόρας Σάμιος ἐποίησεν.

Alphabet and dialect are uniform, the Ionic of the artist, who, however, in his own name prefers the form common to all dialects except his own to the strictly Ionic Πυθαγόρης.

Works of the Parian Artist Euphron

Loewy 48; Roberts I, 143; from near the Peiraeus:

> Πύθων ᾿Ερμῆι ἄγαλμα ᾿Ερμοστρά|τō ᾿Αβδηρίτης
> ἔστησεμ πολλὰς | θησάμενος πόλῃας
> Εὔφρων ἐ|ξεποίησ᾿ οὐκ ἀδαής Πάριος.

The dedication and artist's signature are uniform in dialect (Ionic, appropriate to both parties, with epic influence), and also in alphabet. Kirchhoff *Studien*[4], p. 17, argued that, since the alphabet does not show the characteristic Parian type, it must be that of Abdera, the home of the dedicator. Similarly Roberts, p. 171: "The sculptor then, the Parian Euphron, possibly adapted himself to the local alphabet of the dedicator, Python of Abdera." But this view is to be given up, in view of the fact that the same alphabet is employed in the case of another work by the same artist (cf. the following). It is evident that Euphron was accustomed to use the ordinary Ionic alphabet, and we now know also that in Paros itself this displaced the distinctive Parian type during the fifth century. Cf. *IG* XII, v, 108; Ditt. *Syll.*[2] 569.

IG I, Suppl. 373[269] (p. 205); E. Hoffmann *Syll. Epigr. Graec.* 258; from Athens:

> [Σμ]ικύθη μ᾿ ἀνέ[θηκ|εν ᾿Αθ]ηναίηι τό[δ᾿ ἄγαλ|μα
> εὐξαμέ]νη [δι᾿ ⏑ – – ⏑] ὑπὲρ πα[ίδων κ]αὶ ἑαυτ[ῆς].
> Εὔφρω[ν Πάριος ἐπο|ί]ησεν.

The dedicator was in all probability an Athenian woman. The use of the Ionic alphabet and the Ionic form ᾿Αθηναίηι is to be laid to the account of the artist.[1]

---

[1] Otherwise Mess *Quaestiones de epigrammate Attico et tragoedia antiquiore dialecticae* 7 ff., who discusses this inscription at length. He makes no account of the fact

IG I, Suppl. 373²⁷⁰ (p. 205); from Athens:

Φαῖδρο[ς Π]ροθν - - - | Κεφαλε͂θεν
ἀνέθ[ε͂κ] εν. Εὔφρὸν ἐποίε[σ]εν.

This time the alphabet is Attic throughout, and no doubt the dialect, too, would show itself Attic, not Ionic, if anything distinctive occurred.

The three following signatures of the Cretan artist Cresilas of Cydonia are adapted, in alphabet and dialect, to the dedications.

IG IV, 683; Loewy 46; Michel 1066; Roberts I, 287; from Hermione:

'Αλεξίας Λύονος ἀνεθέ[κε] | τᾶι Δάματρι τᾶι χθονία[ι] | Ηερμιονεύς. |
Κρε͂σίλας ἐποίεσε Κυδονιάτ[ας].

Alphabet and dialect of Hermione.

IG I, 402; Loewy 45; Michel 1055; from Athens:

Ηερμόλυκος | Διειτρέφὸς | ἀπαρχέν. |
Κρε͂σίλας | ἐπόεσεν.

Attic alphabet and dialect.

IG I, 403; Loewy 46; Hoffmann *Syll. Epigr. Graec.* 269; from Athens:

Τόνδε Πύρης] ἀνέθεκε Πολυμνέστο φίλο[ς υἱός]
εὐξάμενος δεκάτεν Παλλάδι Τριτογενεῖ.
Κυδονιέτας Κρε͂σίλας ἐργάσσατο.

Attic alphabet (except Ξ) and Ionic epic dialect throughout. Here we must agree with Mess, in the dissertation cited above (p. 138), that this is one of the clear cases of the use of the epic dialect in

that the artist was an Ionian, pointing out that the Ionic alphabet was sometimes used by Attic writers in the fifth century, and arguing that 'Αθηναίηι is due merely to epic influence. The author of this important dissertation has shown successfully that Kirchhoff's tenet (*Hermes* V, 56), according to which inscriptional epigrams of Attic authorship show the Attic forms without the slightest admixture of any other dialect, cannot be maintained in all its rigor. There are some instances of Ionic forms due to epic influence or even of Doric forms due to lyric influence, where there is no reason to question the Attic authorship. But it remains true that such cases are exceptional, and that, particularly in the matter of ā, η, Attic metrical inscriptions, until the Alexandrian period, maintain the Attic forms with a high degree of consistency (for examples, cf. Meisterhans-Schwyzer, p. 17). Specifically, 'Αθηναίη occurs only here and in the dedication of Hegelochus, who was clearly an Ionian resident of Athens (see below, p. 143), as against nearly a dozen examples of 'Αθηναία in early Attic metrical inscriptions; and where a special explanation of this, and also of the use of the Ionic alphabet throughout, is available, it is not proper to ignore it.

an Attic metrical inscription, and that there is no occasion to assume with Kirchhoff and others, that Κυδōνιέτας is an error. For the alternation of Ion. η with Dor. ā retained in the final syllable, Mess compares 'Αδριηνᾶς in Eur. *Hipp.* 736. One may also recall the similar alternation of Att.-Ion. η and Dor. ā in κυβερνήτας Bacchylides 5. 47 and other like cases.

Roberts II, 197; from Athens:

> Ἄρχερμος ἐποίεσεν ὁ Χῖος.
> Ἰφιδίκε μ' ἀνέθεκεν 'Αθεναίαι πολιόχōι.

The dedication, as well as the signature, is from the hand of the Chian artist. He intended to follow the Attic style of writing, and, after correcting ἐποίΗσεν to ἐποίΕσεν, avoids the use of η or ω. But his native habit shows through in the omission of the spiritus asper (ὁ not hο), and in the forms of certain letters which are at variance with the Attic usage.

Passing now from such special cases, where dedication and artist's signature by citizens of different states are juxtaposed or combined, we may consider other dedications or artists' signatures with reference to the question of local influence.

A stock example for the substitution of the local alphabet is the one cited by Premerstein, the Delphian dedication, or as we now know two identical dedications, by the sons of the Parian Charopinus:

> ΤΟΙΥΑΡΟΓΙΝΟΠΑΙΔΕΣΑΝΕΘΕΣΑΝΤΟΓΑΡΙΟ
> τοὶ Χαροπίνō παῖδες ἀνέθεσαν τō Παρίō.

Cf. Kirchhoff *Studien* 144; Roberts I, 230 *bis*, and for the second copy, Homolle *BCH* XX, 582. Kirchhoff pointed out that neither dialect nor alphabet could be Parian, and must therefore be the epichoric. The dialect, however, is mixed; τοί is Delphian, but ἀνέθεσαν Ionic. Homolle *Fouilles de Delphes* IV, 56, makes the plausible suggestion that Charopinus was a Parian sculptor who had taken up his residence at Delphi. This would explain at once the Delphian character of the dedication by his sons.

The fragmentary dedication of Micciades and Archermus of Chios, found at Delos, is generally believed to be in the alphabet of Delos, not that of Chios. Cf. Kirchhoff *Studien* 83 ff.; Roberts I, 24a; Loewy 1; *SGDI* 5387. Otherwise Hoffmann *Gr. Dial.* III, 59.

The Cleobis and Biton dedication reads as follows, according to Premerstein *Oest. Jhrh.* XIII, 44.   Cf. also Homolle *BCH* XXIV, 447 ff., *Fouilles de Delphes* 7 ff.; Pomtow *Woch. f. klass. Phil.* 1911, 526; Baunack *Philologus* LXX, 312.

    a) [Κλέοβις καὶ Βί]τōν τὰν ματάρα

    b) ἐάγαγον τōι δυγōι | . . . μέδες ἐποίεε hαργεῖος.

The alphabet had been called Argive by Homolle, but Premerstein points out that the characters which occur here are such as have substantially the same form in both the Argive and the Phocian alphabets.   The dialect, he thinks, can only be Phocian (Delphian). But this question of dialect is more complicated.   The form ματάρα, the reading of which is declared certain, is without doubt Delphian, ranging itself beside Delph. φάρεν, δάρματα, and πενταμαριτεύων, with αρ from ερ, as regularly in Locrian and Elean.   This is enough to show that the dedication was not inscribed at Argos, but at Delphi.   But did the Delphian stonecutter use his own dialect throughout, or did just this one form of his native dialect slip in, while he otherwise followed correctly an Argive copy?   This latter, I believe, is correct.   The form of crasis[1] seen in hαργεῖος (ὁ Ἀργεῖος) is so well attested in early Argolic inscriptions as to demand recognition as one of the characteristics of the dialect.   So Arg. τἀργεῖοι (τοὶ Ἀργεῖοι), *Inschr. von Olympia* 250, 251; Arg. Ηαγελαΐδα τἀργείō (ὁ Ἀγελαΐδα τοῦ Ἀργείου), *ibid.* 631; Epid. ταἰσκλαπιεῖ (τῷ Α-), *IG* IV, 1203 (the editor reads hαισκλαπιεῖ, but Kabbadias' reading is probably correct; cf. Solmsen *Inscr. select.*, p. 45, footnote).   From other dialects, leaving Attic out of account, there are a few scattering examples, namely, so as far I know, one each in Corinthian, Arcadian, Rhodian, and several in Cyprian.   But none such occurs in Delphian, which has only τὠπόλλωνι etc., like most of the other dialects.   Where, as in this dedication, it is a question of Delphian or Argive dialect, hαργεῖος is as distinctive of the latter as is ματάρα of the former.

The verb form ἐποίεε Premerstein says cannot stand for the Argive aorist ἐποίϝεhε, and must therefore be regarded as Phocian and an imperfect.   But there is no ground for the inference that,

[1] In reality, I believe, elision instead of true crasis; cf. my *Greek Dialects*, p. 73 with footnote.   But this does not affect the present argument.

taken as an imperfect, it must be Phocian. The form is equally
strange in either dialect. Although intervocalic ϝ lasted longer
in Argolic than in Phocian, in a sixth-century inscription it is to be
expected in Phocian also (cf. κλέϝος, αἰϝεί on the altar of Crissa).
The absence of contraction in ἐποίεε, which Premerstein calls "das
erste urkundliche Zeugniss für die unkontrahierte Vorstufe zu
ἐποίει," but which can be explained only in the manner suggested to
him by Kretschmer, namely, as due to the analogical influence of
forms like ἐποίεον with regularly uncontracted εο, is just as likely
to be Argive as Delphian. Or better, it is no more unlikely.
We have some few examples of verb forms with uncontracted εη,
as Locr. δοκέει, etc., which are probably due to analogical influence
(cf. my Greek Dialects, §§ 42. 4 and 45. 5), but nothing parallel to
ἐποίεε, outside the pages of Herodotus. Accordingly I prefer to
believe that the first of the two E's is intended for ϝ (cf. EOINON=
ϝοῖνον in the Delphian stadium inscription, and other similar cases[1])
and that the correct reading is ἐποίϝε. This form might be either
Delphian or Argive.

In δυγο͂ι=ζυγῷ, if Premerstein's reading is accepted,[2] the δ=ζ
is new for either Delphian or Argive. But in view of the special
relations between the Argive and Laconian dialects, the occurrence
of ζ=δ in an early Argive inscription, and certain other facts (cf.
especially Meister Dorer und Achäer 52 ff.; in connection with
Rhod. τοζ' =τοδ', note that Δεύς has now turned up on a Rhodian
vase), it may be said that the eventual appearance of δ=ζ in Argive
has been looked for.

Dedication of land to the Muses of Helicon, by Philetaerus, son
of Attalus of Pergamum. Two identical copies found in the neigh-
borhood of Thespiae. Homolle BCH VIII, 158; IG VII, 1789;
Michel 1103:

Φιλέτηρος 'Αττάλω Περγαμεὺς ἀνέθεικε τὰν γᾶν τῆς Μώσης τῆς 'Ελικω-
νιάδεσσι ἱαρὰν εἶμεν ἐν τὸν πάντα χρόνον.

Philetaerus, whose patronage of the Greek cults and festivals is
evidenced by dedications and decrees in his honor found at Athens,

[1] Cf. Kretschmer Vaseninschriften, 97; Solmsen Untersuchungen, 147.

[2] This is questioned by Pomtow Woch. f. klass. Phil. 1911, 529, who still prefers
to read τοι δ' υἱοί.

Delos, Olympia, and Delphi (cf. Homolle, *loc. cit.*), had acquired and donated to the proper authorities certain land to be consecrated to the Muses of Helicon. The form of dedication is evidently not one furnished by Philetaerus himself. Rather the Boeotian beneficiaries commemorated his gift in their own dialect, but in the form of a dedication in his name.

Dedications by the Theran Archedamus, from the Cave of Vari at the foot of Mt. Hymettus. Dunham *Am. Jour. Arch.* 1903, 297 ff.; Roberts II, 199–201; *SGDI* IV, 796 ff.:

a) Ἀρχέδαμος ho Θέρ|αῖος κᾶπον Νύ|μφαις ἐφύτευσεν

b) Ἀρχέδ[α]μος [h]o Θέρ|αῖος καὶ χο̄(ρ)ον ὀ(ρ)χε̄στε[ῖ] Νύνφαι ἐχ|σοι-κ[οδό]με̄σεν.

d) Ἀρχέδημος ὁ Θ|ηραῖος ὁ νυμφ|όληπτος φραδ|αῖσι νυμφο̂ν τ|άντρον ἐξηργ|άξατο.

The dedicator, a native of Thera but doubtless a resident of Athens, follows the local practice in writing (*a* and *b* in Attic alphabet, *d* in Ionic except for O=ω), but in dialect mixes Attic and Doric forms. Even in *d*, where his name appears in Attic form, he uses the Theran ἐξηργάξατο. The restoration of *b*, ll. 2, 3, is uncertain.[1]

EPITAPHS

In his article on the epigram in Pauly-Wissowa, Reitzenstein remarks (p. 78): "Der Dialekt ist wesentlich epichorisch; wenn der Tote im Ausland begraben ist, der seiner Heimat. Doch hat die Einwirkung des Epos oder der Lyrik ab und an auch die dialekt-ische Form beeinflusst." The matter of literary influence is nowhere more correctly and concisely stated. But the words "wenn der Tote im Ausland begraben ist, der seiner Heimat" are only in part true of the facts, and imply a misconception, which may be observed in other writers, too, of what determines the dialect. Just as the dialect of honorary decrees is determined by that of the authors, not by that of the recipients, so the dialect of epitaphs is determined by that of the authors, not primarily by that of the deceased. If

---

[1] The metrical dedication of Hegelochus (Loewy 40; Roberts I, 67), who was evidently an Ionian resident in Athens, is in the Attic alphabet but in the Ionic dialect, the only inconsistency being the spiritus asper in hυιός, this being properly omitted in the dedicator's own name.

CARL DARLING BUCK

epitaphs are actually, in the great majority of cases, in the dialect of the deceased, it is because they are usually from the hands of relatives or compatriots, whose dialect is the same. But in the case of those buried on alien soil this may or may not be true. Note the following illustrations, of which the first three are in the dialect of the deceased, and the next three not in that of the deceased.[1]

Hicks[2] 18; Dragoumis *Athen. Mitt.* XXII, 52; Wilamowitz *Gött. Nachr.* 1897, 306; Wilhelm *Oest. Jhrh.* II, 227; found at Salamis:

Epitaph of the Corinthians slain at Salamis. As we learn from Plutarch, the Athenians allowed the Corinthians to bury their own dead at Salamis. The epitaph is accordingly in the Corinthian alphabet and dialect.

Hicks[2] 28; Roberts I, 77; found at Athens:

Fragment of an epitaph and list of Cleonaeans (and Argives?) who were slain in the Battle of Tanagra, and, as Athenian allies, received burial at Athens (Paus. I, 29, 5). The names show their Doric form and the alphabet is the Argive. The copy for the inscription was doubtless furnished by the compatriots of the dead.

IG I, 477; Loewy 8; Hoffmann *Syll. Epigr. Graec.* 11; found at Athens:

Dedication by Phocylides in memory of his wife Lampito. The alphabet is Attic, but the dialect Ionic. The phrase γῆς ἀπὸ πατρωίης shows that Lampito (and doubtless her husband) was a foreigner, and it is an altogether reasonable presumption from the dialect that the family was Ionian. Cf. Kirchhoff *Hermes* V, 54.

IG IX, i, 867; Roberts I, 98; *SGDI* 3188:

Monument of Menecrates at Corcyra. Menecrates was a native of Oeanthea, but this monument to him is from the hands of the people of Corcyra whose proxenus he had been. The epitaph is accordingly in the Corinthian alphabet and dialect (with epic mixture).

IG I, Suppl. 491[12] (p. 115); Hoffmann *Syll. Epigr. Graec.* 32:

Monument of Pythagoras at Athens. Pythagoras was a native of Salybria, a Megarian colony, but the monument was set up by

---

[1] The epitaph of a Syracusan woman at Athens, ΑΝΑΞΑΓΟΡΑ ΣΤΡΟΚΟΣΙΑ, is taken by Kirchhoff *Studien*[4] 109 to be in the Syracusan alphabet, but this is a doubtful case. For the only two non-Attic characters, Ξ and Γ, may also be Ionic, since these were not infrequently used at Athens in the fifth century.

the people of Athens, whose proxenus he had been. The epitaph is accordingly in the Attic dialect (with epic coloring in the vocabulary) except for the natural retention of the original form of the name Σαλυβρία and the Ionic form Πυθαγόρην. This last is in puzzling contrast to the converse substitution of Πυθαγόρας by the Samian artist (above, p. 138), and even the explanation suggested by Mess Quaest. de epigr. Att., p. 14, is not entirely convincing. The use of the Ionic alphabet is, in spite of Kirchhoff, perhaps of no special significance here.

IG IV, 49; Roberts I, 127*c*; *SGDI* 3414:

Monument of Gleucitas at Aegina. Gleucitas was a native of Salamis in Cyprus. But the epitaph is in the Aeginetan alphabet and dialect, and probably Diotimus, who set up the monument, was an Aeginetan.

Similar to the two cases preceding the last is the fourth-century epitaph, *IG* II, 1678, of the two Corcyraean envoys who died at Athens and were commemorated by the Athenian state. But there are numerous other fourth-century epitaphs of foreigners who were buried in Athens, e.g., Hoffmann *Syll. Epigr. Graec.* 77, 78, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, where the use of Attic has no such special explanation. Most of these persons had probably become residents of Athens and their children (cf. *op. cit.* 82) or other relatives naturally used Attic.

HONORARY DECREES, ETC.

Decrees granting honors or specific privileges to foreigners or to a foreign state are regularly in the dialect of the party issuing the decree, regardless of the dialect of the party honored. Thus the numerous honorary decrees of the Boeotian League or of any of the Boeotian towns, down to about the middle of the second century B.C., are in the Boeotian dialect, whether the recipient is a citizen of Athens, Alexandria, Antioch, Byzantium, Carthage, Chalcis, Delphi, Phalanna, Naupactus, Rome, Tarentum, or Teos. If Mycenae honors a Gortynian, or Troizene a Plataean, the dialect is that of Argolis. If Tenedos or Mytilene honors the people of Erythrae, the dialect is Aeolic. When the Eleans honor Damocrates of Tenedos, the dialect is the Elean of the time. And so on, in examples so numerous that there can be no doubt as to what is the usual practice.

146   CARL DARLING BUCK

Although the great majority of the extant decrees of this kind are those which were set up in the cities issuing them, there is also a sufficient number represented by the copies which were set up in the home of the recipient. These show the original dialect retained, apart from occasional errors due to the local stonecutter. Thus, to cite a few of the most striking illustrations, an inscription found at Mytilene (*IG* XII, ii, 15) contains the text of a decree of the Aetolian League in favor of Mytilene, in its original Aetolian (Northwest Greek κοινή) form, a copy of which had been brought back by the Mytilenaean envoys. This is followed by a decree of Mytilene, in Lesbian, quoting from the Aetolian decree and ordering the inscription of both. From Cos (Paton and Hicks 13) we have a portion of a decree of Halicarnassus in honor of a Coan citizen and announcing an embassy to Cos to request its publication there. Subjoined is the Coan decree, in Doric, granting this request. Copies of Coan decrees in honor of citizens of Calymna and of another Coan decree accepting the proposal of the Calymnians to honor a Coan physician have been found at Calymna (*SGDI* 3611, 3612, 3619). However, the dialect of Cos and Calymna was the same. From Iasus (Hicks[1] 130) we have a copy of a Calymnian decree, in Doric, in honor of certain judges who had been sent from Iasus. This is preceded by a decree of Iasus, in the κοινή, in response. From Priene we have a decree of some Aeolian city, in Aeolic, in honor of a judge from Priene (*Inschr. von Priene* 60). Cretan and Delphian decrees in honor of Athenians have been found at Athens (*IG* II, 547, 548, 550). From Delos (Ditt. *Syll.*[2] 722; *SGDI* 5150) we have a decree of Cnossus in honor of Dioscurides the grammarian, a native of Tarsus. According to the text the decree was to be set up at Cnossus, and copies sent to the "Athenians dwelling in Delos" and to the people of Tarsus.[1]

[1] There is also no lack of examples of copies of other classes of decrees and communications which have been set up in the home of the party addressed. The copy of the Spartan decree found at Delos (*SGDI* 4415; Roberts I, 267) is in the Laconian alphabet as well as dialect, though the subjoined names of the magistrates are in the Ionic alphabet. We have Rhodian decrees found at Iasus, Seleuceia, and Cyzicus (*SGDI* 3750–52), decrees of Iasus, Naxos, Athens, and some Doric city, found at Cos (Paton and Hicks 14–17), decrees of the Aetolians and Naupactians found in Ceos (*IG* XII, v, 526, 527), Aetolian and Cretan decrees found at Mytilene (*IG* XII, ii, 16, 17), etc. From Delphi (*BCH* VI, 460 ff. =*SGDI* 1412, 5151) we have a letter in

We may now consider the few exceptional cases in which an honorary decree is not in the dialect of the party issuing it, but in that of the recipient. One, but of questionable significance, is the decree of Megarian Aegosthena in honor of Boeotian Siphae (*IG* VII, 207), which is mainly in Boeotian, though with several un-Boeotian forms. The use of Boeotian is commonly attributed solely to the fact that the decree was in honor of a Boeotian town,[1] whereas I

Cretan from Axus to the Aetolians, subjoined to a decree of the Aetolians in response. From Athens we have a copy of the amphictyonic decree of 380 B.C. (*SGDI* 2501) in its original Delphian form. In this case the Athenians are not specifically addressed, and no doubt several other copies were set up elsewhere. The most extensive series of foreign decrees are those found at Teos (Le Bas et Waddington III, 61 ff.) and at Magnesia on the Maeander (Kern *Inschr. von Magnesia*), dating from the early part of the second century B.C., and accordingly showing the various dialects employed in a mixed form. The Teian series embraces decrees, granting the privilege of asylum to the temple of Dionysus at Teos, from the Romans in the Attic κοινή, from the Delphians and the Aetolians in Northwest Greek κοινή, from the Athamanes in the Attic κοινή, and from twenty Cretan towns in various forms of mixed Cretan. The Magnesian series comprises replies to an invitation of Magnesia to participate in the festival of Artemis Leucophryene, also several decrees in honor of citizens of Magnesia, and affords a comprehensive picture of the linguistic conditions of the time. There are decrees in Arcadian, Boeotian, Lesbian, Thessalian, Cretan, Doric κοινή (from Corinth, Corcyra, Apollonia, Epidamnus, Epirus, Acarnania, Achaea, Cnidus, Cos [?], Rhodes), Northwest Greek κοινή (from Aetolia, Cephallenia, Ithaca, Phocis, Messenia), and the Attic κοινή (nearly all these from Attic-Ionic territory or the Macedonian cities of the Orient).

[1] Foucart (Le Bas et Waddington II, Explic., p. 2) says Boeotian was used "sans doute pour être mieux compris des Siphéens." Meister (note to *SGDI* 1145) says: "Ein Akt besonderer Höflichkeit war es, dass man in Aegosthenä den gefassten Beschluss in den böotischen Dialekt übertragen liess, um ihn in böotischer Fassung nach Siphä zu schicken; dass bei dieser Uebertragung einige unböotische Schreibungen (ἐπιδή 2, ἐκ 3, 9, ἐκτεθήκανθι 6, ὅπωτ 8, δαῖζοι 12) in den Text hineingekommen sind, erscheint begreiflich." This is also the conclusion of Dittenberger (note to *IG* VII, 207), who discusses the other alternative only to reject it. His comment raises the issue so distinctly that it must be quoted in full: "Plebiscitum n. 207 Boeotica dialecto composita est. Quod utrum Aegosthenitae fecissent, ut Siphensibus Boeotis gratificarentur, an quia ipsi tum Boeotorum societati ascripti essent, Boeckhius quidem (*Opp.* VI, p. 365) dubitabat. Sed eos populos, qui cum natione Boeoti non essent per aliquod temporis spatium foederis Boetici participes erant, nequaquam propterea in actis publicis sermone Boeotico usos esse cum ex reliquis Aegosthenitarum titulis et nonnullis Megarensium (n. 27, 28, 29) tum ex permagno numero decretorum Oropiorum apparet, quae ad unum omnia Attica dialecto composita sunt (n. 237 ff.). Restat igitur prior Boeckhii interpretatio; etsi haec quoque res satis inusitata est, tamen aliquot eius generis exempla extant, veluti decretum Arcadeum quo Phylarchus Atheniensis honoribus afficitur (*Syll. Inscr. Gr.* 167) ipsum quidem sermone Attico compositum, cum index nominum subiunctus dialecti Arcadicae formas habeat." But where we are dealing with a practice which is admittedly unusual from either point of view, the one decree of Oropus in Boeotian is as good a parallel in one direction as the decree of the Arcadians in the other. Boeotian forms occur also in a decree of the

regard this as, at most, only a contributory factor, since Boeotian forms and expressions occur in several other inscriptions of Aegosthena, which was at this time in the Boeotian League. Certainly the case has no such unambiguous significance as it would have if it were, for example, a decree in honor of a Thessalian town and in Thessalian.

The stock example, the one cited by Dittenberger in the note just quoted, and the one which even misled Hoffmann, *Griech. Dial.* I, 67 (cf. above, p. 134), into a generalization which is the reverse of the truth, is the decree of the Arcadians in honor of the Athenian Phylarchus, Ditt. *Syll.*[2] 106; Michel 193. While the subscribed names of the officials keep their native form, the decree proper is in Attic. But, for the very reason that this is an exception to the general practice in honorary decrees, it is not enough to say merely, with Dittenberger, that Attic was used out of compliment to the person honored. May not the explanation lie in part in the linguistic situation of the time in Arcadia, about which, unfortunately, we are still very imperfectly informed? The date of the inscription was formerly put in the third century B.C., but the character of the letters is more suitable to the fourth century, and for this and other reasons, this date is now preferred. Cf. Dittenberger's note, and most recently Hiller von Gärtringen *Athen. Mitt.* 1911, 349 ff. It is long prior, and would be even with the later dating, to the final adoption of the Attic κοινή in Arcadia. But this is equally true of a decree of Tegea in honor of a Thessalian Agesandrus, Ditt. *Syll.*[2] 476, Michel 189, which is of about the same time, and which is also in Attic.[1] In this connection may be mentioned also another fourth-

Phocians (*Inschr. von Magnesia* 34). And, what is more to the point, other inscriptions of Aegosthena do contain Boeotian forms though not nearly so many as the decree in honor of Siphae. Dittenberger recognizes those in No. 208, but thinks they are due to the fact that the stonecutter had just been working on No. 207 ("quae in animo scribae ex eis quae paullo ante exaraverat haesisse videntur"). But we have also the Boeotian phrase ἐν πελτοφόρας in 210, 211, 214, ἔλεξε in 219, ἀπε-[γρ]άφανθο in 214. Plainly it was not unusual to employ Boeotian forms at this time, and at most only their more nearly consistent use in No. 207 can be attributed to the fact that it was in honor of a Boeotian town.

[1] The only trace of the native dialect is the retention of ἔμπασις =ἔγκτησις, and even this not in its strictly local form (ἴνπασις). The date of the inscription is generally given as the end of the third century B.C. But this rests on the remarks of Sauppe *De titulis Tegeaticis* pp. 5, 6: "In universum igitur literatura eius simillima

century Arcadian decree, that of Psophis in honor of a Naxian, *Inschr. von Olympia* 294. Dittenberger says that the use of Ionic "mag in einer Rücksicht auf die Heimat des Geehrten seinen Grund haben," and again refers to the Phylarchus decree as an example of this practice. But there is nothing in the inscription which may not be Attic as well as Ionic. It is evident that the occasional employment of Attic in Arcadian inscriptions (its influence upon the native dialect is apparent in the Tegean building inscription) is earlier than had been supposed. Only subsequent discoveries can determine whether this was confined to certain classes of inscriptions, such as those involving foreign relations like these two decrees, and how far it was restricted in time within certain narrow limits.[1]

Michel 188; *Inschr. von Olympia* 30:

Ἔδοξεν Ἀλειοῖσι. Δίφιλον τὸν Ἀθαν[αῖ]ον, Μελανόπō hυιύν, πρόξενον καὶ εὐεργέταν τῶν Ἀλειῶν γράφσαι ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι ἔδοξεν.

Meister *Griech. Dial.* II, 79, is certainly right in recognizing an Attic admixture in both writing and dialect,[2] and in his explanation of the same. This is not a copy of the original honorary decree but of an authorization to publish its result at Olympia. Diphilus had attended to the matter himself, and in preparing the copy of the authorization had allowed some Attic peculiarities to slip in.

est, quae in titulis P. Foucarti et A. Michaelis esse dicitur," and p. 8: "Itaque hoc unum restat, ut comparatis literarum formis cum eis, quae in titulo foederis arcadici habentur, etiam tegeaticum Agesandri eodem fere tempore scriptum esse iudicemus, i.e., sub finem tertii ante Christum natum saeculi." The two inscriptions here referred to are the Phylarchus decree, which as noted above is now dated in the fourth century, and the Tegean building inscription, which was also formerly dated in the third century, but which, according to Wilhelm *Beiträge zur griech. Inschriftkunde* 21, belongs rather to the fourth. The forms of the letters in the Agesandrus decree, as described by Sauppe and as represented by Milchhöfer *Athen. Mitt.* IV, 140, also point to the fourth century.

[1] We know that the advance of Attic influence in Arcadia was not one of uninterrupted progress. The native dialect persisted till about 200 B.C. (the decree of Megalopolis, Ditt. *Syll.*[2] 258, with all its mixture, is essentially Arcadian). But before this there had come into use, through the influence of the Aetolian and Achaean Leagues, a form of Doric κοινή, and it is this, not the Attic κοινή, which prevails in Arcadian inscriptions of the last two centuries B.C.

[2] Doubted by Dittenberger-Purgold, *loc. cit.* But, though Meister's points are not all equally certain, the one occurrence of L =λ, and the ν- movable in ἔδοξεν, are not to be explained away.

Ditt. *Syll.*² 483; Michel 316; *SGDI* 1340 = 4256:

[Θεός. τ]ύχα ἀγαθά.] [ἐπὶ π]ροστάτα Λευ[κ]άρου, ἀφικομένων Ἱπποσθένεος, Τει[σία], Ἑρμωνος, Σελίνιος, ἔδοξε τοῖς Μολοσσοῖς προξενία[ν] δόμειν τοῖς Ἀκραγαντίνοις.

The infinitive in -μειν is confined to the dialect of Rhodes and its colonies, hence δόμειν must belong to the speech of the Agrigentines, not the Molossians. Yet we must take decided issue with the statement in the note to *SGDI* 4256: "Die Urkunde ist den Akragantinern zu Ehren in ihrer, nicht in der Sprache der Molosser abgefasst." There is not the slightest probability that the Molossians employed the dialect of the Agrigentines in their original decree. But the envoys mentioned in the decree, who had come from Agrigentum and obtained a decree of proxeny in its favor, had themselves furnished the copy for its publication at Dodona, and, probably inadvertently, used their familiar δόμειν.

An interesting fact, perhaps to be explained in the same way, if not accidental, is that in a long series of decrees of Olus in different hands (*SGDI* 5104) the one in honor of certain Gortynians (No. II) shows Γορτυνίους προξένους ἦμεν καὶ εὐεργέτανς καὶ πολίτανς καὶ αὐτὸνς καὶ ἐγγόνονς, whereas all the others have only -ος or -ους in the accusative plural. It was at Gortyna and Cnossus that the forms in -νς persisted longest.

INTERSTATE ARBITRATIONS

Decisions of interstate arbitration were regularly rendered in the dialect of the arbitrators, and copies in this form were set up by the states involved in the dispute, at home and often also in one of the religious centers as Olympia or Delos. The majority of the extant inscriptions of this class,[1] as it happens, involve arbitrators and disputants who have the same dialect anyway, or had come to use the same at the given date, by the spread of one of the forms of κοινή. So, for example, besides those most numerous cases in which the use of Attic κοινή was common to all parties, a decision of unknown arbitrators in a dispute between Sparta

---

[1] Conveniently grouped in Berard *De arbitrio inter liberas Graecorum civitates.* Many of the texts there cited are not copies of the decisions proper, but decrees of parties to a dispute either authorizing arbitration or carrying out its terms.

and the Achaeans acting in behalf of Megalopolis, copy found at Olympia (*Inschr. von Olympia* 47), is in the Doric κοινή, which at the time, second century B.C., was used throughout the Peloponnesus; a decision of the Aetolians in a dispute between two towns of Phthiotis, Melitea and Perea, copy found at Melitea (Ditt. *Syll.*[2] 425; *SGDI* 1415), is in the Northwest Greek κοινή, which was regularly used by the Aetolians, but also at this time, about 200 B.C., in Phthiotis.

But there remain some examples of decisions rendered by arbitrators whose dialect was not the same as that of the disputants.

Decision of the Argives in a dispute between the islands of Melos and Cimolos, copy set up at Cimolos, whence it was carried in modern times to Smyrna (*IG* XII, iii, 1259; Ditt. *Syll.*[2] 428; *SGDI* 3277; fourth century B.C.).—This is in the Argive dialect; note especially the specifically Argive word ἀρήτευε.

Another, recently discovered, Argive inscription (*BCH* XXXIV, 331 ff.; cf. also *Class. Phil.* VI, 219; fifth century B.C.) regulates the relations of Cnossus and Tylissus in Crete. If we had the copy set up at Tylissus, to which reference is made in the text, it would show the same Argive dialect.

Decision of the Megarians in a dispute between Corinth and Epidaurus, copy found at Epidaurus (*IG* IV, 926; Ditt. *Syll.*[2] 452; *SGDI* 3025; Michel 20; between 242 and 234 B.C.).—Here, it must be admitted, nothing occurs, except in the personal names subscribed, which could not be Epidaurian as well as Megarian, and one feature, the psilosis in ἐπ' ἱαρεῦς, is due to the Epidaurian stonecutter (cf. my *Greek Dialects* § 58b).

Decision of the Rhodians in a dispute between Samos and Priene, copy found at Priene (*Inschr. von Priene* 37; *SGDI* 3758; early second century B.C.).—This is in the Rhodian dialect, in the mixed form which appears in all Rhodian inscriptions of the time. An earlier decision of Lysimachus in the same dispute is of course in the Attic κοινή, as regularly used by the Macedonians.

Decision of the Milesians in the dispute between the Spartans and Messenians, copy found at Olympia (*Inschr. von Olympia* 52; Ditt. *Syll.*[2] 314; Michel 31; about 135 B.C.).—This is in the Attic κοινή, which had long since been adopted by the Ionians, but not yet by

either Spartans or Messenians. This decision is preceded on the stone by a decree of the Eleans, in Doric κοινή, granting the request of the Messenians that they be allowed to publish the decision at Olympia, and followed by a Roman decree, this last of course in Attic κοινή.

Of a decision of the Magnesians in a dispute between Itanus and Hierapytna we have parts of two copies, one from Magnesia and one from Itanus (*Inschr. von Magnesia* 105; Ditt. *Syll.*² 929; about 138 B.C.). Where the same portion is preserved in both copies, they agree except in some insignificant matters of spelling. The decision is of course in the Attic κοινή, but various Cretan documents, such as boundary records, decrees, and letters, are incorporated, in their original dialect.

TREATIES

Of the thirty-five or so epigraphical texts of Greek treaties which are given by R. von Scala *Staatsverträge des Altertums*, erster Teil (down to 338 B.C.), all but four are in Attic. That this is the case is due simply to the fact that they are, except the four, treaties between Athens and various other states and are the Athenian versions of the same, found at Athens. The other parties to the treaties are of different speech, Boeotians, Thessalians, Locrians, Phocians, Arcadians, Corcyraeans, Eretrians, Mytilenaeans, Argives, Byzantians, etc., but there is no trace of this in the form employed, not even when the oath to be taken by the other party is quoted—with one exception: In a treaty with Corcyra (Scala 143; Ditt. *Syll.*² 84; Hicks² 106; Michel 9; 374 B.C.) there is a feeble attempt, not consistently carried out, to give its proper Doric form to the oath to be taken by the Corcyraeans (αἴ κά τις = ἐάν τις of the Athenian oath, though the proper Doric order is αἴ τίς κα, also [θ]άλασσ[αν], [Δά]ματ[ρα], but [γ]ῆν, [δ]ήμωι). In a treaty with the Thessalians (Scala 176; Ditt. *Syll.*² 108; Hicks² 123; Michel 11; 361/0 B.C.) the oath to be taken by the Thessalians is given, like all of the rest of the text, in Attic. This is what is to be expected, not the touch of linguistic realism seen in the Corcyraean oath, which is rare.[1]

---

[1] Just as linguistic realism is almost unknown among the Greek prose-writers Xenophon being a notable exception in his fondness for a bit of dialectic color here and there. The puzzle in Thucydides is not that speeches of foreigners and treaties are

The four treaties in other dialects which are included in v. Scala's collection are: treaty found at Olympia, and in the Elean dialect, between two towns otherwise unknown, but doubtless, at least one of them, Elean (Scala 33; *Inschr. von Olympia* 10; Michel 2; *SGDI* 1150; sixth or fifth century B.C.); another from Olympia, and in the Elean dialect (Scala 27; *Inschr. von Olympia* 9; Hicks[2] 9; Michel 1; *SGDI* 1149; sixth century B.C.) between the Eleans and the Heraeans of Arcadia (? this is the usual view, but is doubted by Niese *Genethliakon Carl Robert*, p. 20); treaty between Oeanthea and Chaleion, found at Oeanthea, in the Locrian dialect (Scala 58; *IG* IX, i, 333; Hicks[2] 44; Michel 3; *SGDI* 1479; fifth century B.C.); treaty between the Olynthian Confederacy and Amyntas of Macedon, found at Olynthus, and in the Euboean dialect (Scala 107; Ditt. *Syll.*[2] 77; Hicks[2] 95; *SGDI* 5285; 389–383 B.C.).

Another, not given in v. Scala's collection, though falling within its chronological limits, is the treaty between Eretria and Histiaea, found at Eretria, and in the local Eretrian variety of Euboean (Michel 7; *SGDI* 5307; early fourth century B.C.). Cf. also the monetary agreement between Mytilene and Phocaea, found at Mytilene and in the Lesbian dialect (*IG* XII, ii, 1; Hicks[2] 94; Michel 8; *SGDI* 213; first half of fourth century B.C.); and a customs agreement, between Aegae in Asiatic Aeolis and certain 'Ολυμπηνοί (revised text by Keil-Premerstein *Denkschriften Wien. Akad.* LIII, 2, 112 ff.; probably late fourth century B.C.), found near the site of Aegae, and in Aeolic, but with some apparently Ionic forms (cf. Kretschmer *Glotta* III, 301).

Of treaties of later date and not in Attic, the most numerous are those of the third and second centuries between various Cretan cities, as: of Drerus with Cnossus (*SGDI* 4952); of Gortyn with Cnossus (*SGDI* 5015), Lappa (*SGDI* 5018), Elyrus (*SGDI* 5014); of Gortyn

---

regularly given in Attic form, but why an exception is made in the case of the two treaties between the Spartans and the Argives (V, 77 and 79). There is no probability in the view of Kirchhoff that all the other texts of treaties, for example of the three between Sparta and Persia (VIII, 18, 37, 58), were copied from actual versions in Attic and that the translation into Attic is never due to Thucydides himself ("deren Urheber auf keinen Fall Thukydides sein könnte, da dieser, wie die beiden letzten Urkunden des fünften Buches beweisen, hellenischen Urkunden nicht attischer Fassung ihre dialektische Fassung zu belassen pflegt"—Kirchhoff *Ueber die von Thukydides benutzten Urkunden*, p. 153).

and Hierapytna with Priansus (*SGDI* 5024); of Hierapytna with
Priansus (*SGDI* 5040), Lyttus (*SGDI* 5041), Cnossus (*SGDI* 5073),
Praesus (*Rev. ét. gr.* 1911, 379 ff.), Itanus (*Rev. ét. gr.* 1911, 415 ff.);
of Malla with Lyttus (*SGDI* 5100); of Olus with Lyttus, copy found
at Athens (*SGDI* 5147); of Olus with Lato (*SGDI* 5075); cf. also
two inscriptions from Delos containing agreements of Olus and
Lato to submit their differences to the arbitration of Cnossus (*SGDI*
5149 and *BCH* XXIX, 204 ff.). While the same type of modified
Cretan was common to both parties in the case of many of these
treaties, e.g., to Gortyn and Cnossus, to Olus and Lato, this is not
true of all. That between Drerus and Cnossus, copy found at Dre-
rus, is in a mixed type which differs much from that seen in con-
temporaneous inscriptions of Cnossus. At Hierapytna a Doric
κοινή, lacking the special characteristics of central Cretan, was
employed. It is this which appears in the treaty with Lyttus, the
copy of which, though transported to Venice, must have come from
Hierapytna, as is shown also by the fact that the same stone contains
two other treaties of Hierapytna; likewise in the treaty with Priansus,
the copy of which, though transported to Oxford, undoubtedly
came from Hierapytna. But the treaty between Hierapytna and
Cnossus is in a dialect which indicates that the copy, the actual
provenance of which is unknown, represents the Cnossian version,
and it is therefore so classed by Blass (*SGDI* 5073). So the dialect
of the treaty of Gortyn and Hierapytna with Priansus is such as to
indicate that our copy, transported to Venice, is either the Gortynian
or the Priansian version, probably the former and so classed by Blass
(*SGDI* 5024). There are also from Hierapytna, and in the Doric
κοινή, a treaty with the Magnesians on the Maeander (*SGDI* 5042),
and one with Rhodes. But the latter is rightly classed as a Rhodian
inscription (*SGDI* 3749), not because of anything in its dialect which
might not, at this time, be Hierapytnian as well as Rhodian, but
because it is in form a decree of Rhodes, a copy of which was brought
to Hierapytna and there set up, embodying the terms of agreement.
The situation is the same in the case of the joint-citizenship agree-
ment, made at the behest of the Aetolian League, between the
Messenians and the Phigalians (Ditt. *Syll.*² 234; *SGDI* 4645; Michel
187; between 250 and 222 B.C.). The text is a copy of the Messenian

decree, sent to Phigalia, there being added a decree of Phigalia accepting the terms of the former.

Among other later treaties in dialect may be mentioned that between certain Lesbian towns, found at Delos, and in the Lesbian dialect (*BCH* XXIX, 210 ff.; third or second century B.C.); one between the Arcadian Orchomenus and Euaemon, in the Arcadian dialect (*Athen. Mitt.* XXXIV, 237 ff.; Solmsen *Inscriptiones Selectae*³ 2; about 300 B.C.); a joint-citizenship agreement between the two Phocian towns of Stiris and Medeon, found at Stiris, and in the Phocian dialect with some peculiarities from the neighboring Boeotian (*IG* IX, i, 32; Ditt. *Syll.*² 426; Michel 24; *SGDI* 1539; early second century B.C.); alliance between the Aetolians and Acarnanians, in Northwest Greek κοινή ('Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1905, 55 ff.; cf. Swoboda *Klio* X, 397, who dates it between 272 and 265 B.C.). This last was ordered published on bronze stelae at Actium, Thermum, Olympia, Delphi, and Dodona. The copy we have is from Thermum. But Wilhelm ('Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1910, 147) has acutely recognized in a small fragment found at Olympia (*Inschr. von Olympia* 40) a portion of the copy set up at Olympia.

In all of the above-mentioned treaties, whenever the parties to a given treaty are such as differ in their native dialect, the dialect employed is the one appropriate to that party in whose territory the text was found, so far as its provenance is actually known. That is, we have the home versions in the home dialect. We naturally conclude that the corresponding version which was set up in the home of the other party (or in the home of each of the several other parties) was likewise in its dialect—that, for example, if we had the version of the monetary agreement between Mytilene and Phocaea which was set up at Phocaea, it would not be in Lesbian, like the copy we have from Mytilene, but in Ionic. And this I take to be the prevailing view, so far as scholars have considered the question at all.[1]

---

[1] It is stated in the most positive form by Kirchhoff *Ueber die von Thukydides benutzten Urkunden*, p. 99, in discussing the treaty quoted in Thuc. v. 47, copies of which were ordered published at Athens (the one of which part has been found), Argos, Mantinea, and Olympia: "Zwar sind die Verträge selbst in Athen geschlossen worden und die originale Formuliring ihres Wortlautes ist darum sicher in attischer Sprachform erfolgt; daran ist aber gar nicht zu denken, dass die in der Peloponnes publicirten Exemplare diese Fassung beibehalten haben sollten. Im Gegentheil ist für sie ebenso gewiss die epichorische Sprachform zur Anwendung gelangt, wie für die

Yet we must look to future discoveries to furnish a concrete demonstration of this, for unfortunately there is no treaty of this kind of which we now possess more than one of the versions.[1] Nor, with all the explicitness which we often find in the directions as to where the different copies were to be published, and whether they were to be inscribed on stone or bronze, is there ever any mention of different dialects to be employed. This, however, is merely a lack of specific confirmation and not to be used as an argument in disproof of the employment of different dialects. For direct allusions to the existing differences in dialect are unknown in epigraphical records, as they are rare in literature.

Pending the discovery of satisfactory concrete evidence, I hold

in Athen publicirten Texte des zu Sparta abgeschlossenen Nikiasfriedens und des ihn ergänzenden Bundesvertrages die attische. Selbst das in Olympia aufgestelltes Exemplar, obwohl im Namen und Auftrage aller am Abschlusse des Vertrages Betheiligten veröffentlicht, kann doch, da es an Stelle einer Sonderpublication der Eleer zu treten hatte und auf elischem Gebiete jedenfalls durch Vermittelung der Eleer errichtet worden ist, keine andere als Elische Sprachform gezeigt haben."

While this statement of Kirchhoff's represents what I believe to be the correct view to take in general of the dialect of different versions, he went too far in denying the possibility of any exceptions and representing it as inconceivable that in this case the formal draft made at Athens was followed in the other copies. See below, p. 157. I do not, however, agree with those who wish to explain the verbal discrepancies between the text of Thucydides and the extant fragment of the Athenian version by assuming that the former was copied from one of the other versions, namely the Elean; and, still less, with Kirchhoff's own view that the discrepancies are due to corruption of the text of Thucydides. This would imply a degree of textual corruption which, if assumed for the text as a whole, would render it folly for anyone to discuss the "language of Thucydides." Thucydides gave the text of the treaty in all essential agreement with the Attic version, but without seeking verbal accuracy, which is a comparatively modern requirement. Inscriptions have taught us, as Wilhelm has pointed out, that official duplicates were not always precisely identical in form.

[1] Two separate versions of a treaty between Olus and Lato found their way to Venice, but, while one came to light only recently, the other long since disappeared and is known only through a transcript of a transcript. Cf. Blass *SGDI* 5075 and especially Dieters *De Cretensium titulis publicis quaestiones epigraphicae* 27 ff. It is evident that the two versions differed here and there in the fulness of detail, in phraseology, in syntax (once αἰ δέ τίς τινα ἀδικήσαι versus αἰ δέ τίς κα τινα ἀδικήσηι), and in the form of individual words. On this last point one must of course be cautious, for the transcript of the lost stone is full of obvious inaccuracies, but the following differences of this kind between the transcript (A) and the extant stone (B) are significant: κῆς A = καὶ ἐς B; ποτί A = πορτί B; πλίονες A = πλίονεν B; 'Εστίαν A = 'Ιστία[ν] B; ῥυθμίζοντες A = ῥυθμίττον[τες] B; πόμπαν, περιαμπέτιξ A = πόππαν, περιαππέτιξ B; (but also περιαμπέτιξ B); 'Ολόντι, 'Ολόντιον, 'Ολοντίως, 'Ολοντίων A = Βολδε(ν)τι, Βολόντιον, Βολοντίος, Βολοεντί(ων) B (ll. 39, 69, 84, elsewhere 'Ολόντι, etc.). Except in the case of κῆς = καὶ ἐς, the A forms quoted show elimination of the local

to the general truth of the view that the versions of the several parties to a treaty were published each in its appropriate dialect— but that on the other hand there might well be exceptions to this owing to the special circumstances of the formulation of a given treaty. The terms of a treaty might be incorporated in a decree passed by one party and copies of this decree be sent to the other party or parties. In this case the decree would be published in its original form, like any other decree sent abroad (cf. above, p. 146). We have already noted from the later period two examples of precisely this procedure (p. 154, bottom). And even where the formulation was not in the form of a decree, it might now and then happen that copies of a formal draft, made by the recording official of that

peculiarities of the B forms. To attribute this to the transcriber, to suppose, for example, that he corrected πορτί into ποτί or ῥυθμίττοντες into ῥυθμίζοντες, is to give him far too much credit. It is just such variations between local Cretan and Doric (or Attic) κοινή forms that are now familiar to us in Cretan inscriptions of this period. But, while the inscriptions of different towns are distinguished by varying degrees of κοινή influence, we have too little material from Olus or Lato separately, to warrant us in deciding, upon this basis, their respective claims to these versions (a third copy, moreover, was ordered set up at Cnossus). Note also that B itself varies between Βολόε[ν]τι, etc., and ᾿Ολόντι, etc., between περιαππέτιξ (and -τις) and περιαμ-πέτιξ, that both versions vary between αι and ει, and that the Olus-Lato arbitration agreement (SGDI 5149) has both πορτί and ποτί, both ἀγγράφοντ[ε]ν (nom. pl. like πλίονεν) and πράξαντες. Yet one may hazard the guess that B, which retains in part the old forms Βολόε(ν)τι, etc. (with β for earlier ϝ), which occur elsewhere only in an Olus-Lyttus treaty (SGDI 5147), was the copy set up at Olus. It is nothing against this that Lato precedes Olus in the introductory lines, for the order is the same in both versions. In general, the order in which the parties to a treaty are mentioned in the heading or text has no such unqualified significance as has sometimes been assumed, e.g., by Boeckh, who, in commenting on this Olus-Lato treaty in the only version then known, asserts (CIG II, p. 406): "nostra quippe tabula hand dubie a Latiis posita est, quemobrem Latii primo loco nominari solent." So recently, but with more reserve, H. J. Reinach Rev. des Ét. Grec. 1911, 381, remarks: "Le fait que, dans l'en-tête comme dans tout le cours du document, les Hiérapytniens sont nommés avant les Praisiens incline à croire que la copie a été faite sur le texte conservé aux archives d'Hiérapytna," and points to other Cretan treaties (SGDI 5015, 5018, 5024, 5040) as conforming. But while the precedence of the home city as the "party of the first part" is the natural order, and is the one followed in perhaps the majority of cases, it is by no means an invariable practice upon which we can rely. Note, for example, from Athenian treaties in the Athenian versions found at Athens [συμ]αχία Βοιω[τῶν καὶ ᾿Αθηναίων] (Hicks² 84); ᾿Ερετριέω[ν συμμαχία] καὶ ᾿Αθηνα[ίων] (Hicks² 86); συμμαχία Κορκυραίων καὶ ᾿Αθηναίων (Hicks² 106).

    As already noted, we have a small fragment of the Olympian copy, besides the nearly complete text from Thermum, of a treaty between the Aetolians and Acarnanians. But, aside from the fact that the fragment is too small to permit any satisfactory comparison, all versions were doubtless in the Northwest Greek κοινή, then employed by both parties, and nothing more than slight accidental variations could be expected.

party at whose home the conference of the envoys arranging the terms took place, were sent to the other parties and published without transfer to the local dialect.

A notable case, mention of which has been deferred until this point, is the inscription, *IG* IV, 556, Hicks[2] 120, pertaining to a peace agreement between the Greek states, probably one made soon after the battle of Mantinea in 362 B.C. It is not the text of the original agreement, but a resolution to announce this agreement and the attitude of the states toward Persia to the representative of the Persian satraps. This copy was found at Argos, but is in the Attic dialect.[1] Upon this Wilhelm *Oest. Jhrh.* III, 147 and 159, remarks:

> Der Dialekt ist der attische, wie Dittenberger gelegentlich bemerkte; an sich für Ort und Zeit auffällig, erklärt er sich durch den Umstand dass die Urkunde nicht Sondergelegenheiten der Argeier betrifft. . . . . Die Inschrift ist nur verständlich als Beschluss der an der κοινὴ εἰρήνη betheiligten Hellenen oder vielmehr als Beschluss ihrer bevollmächtigten Vertreter. Es ist anzunehmen dass die Urkunden solcher gemeinsamen Abmachungen attisch abgefasst, und dass sie von den einzelnen Staaten öffentlich aufgestellt, mindestens im Archiv hinterlegt wurden.

But this is a dangerously broad conclusion. Attic was certainly not a generally recognized medium for interstate proceedings until a very much later period. It is possible that at just this time the situation in Argos and some of the other states with reference to the use of Attic was peculiar (see above, p. 148, on Arcadia). The most probable conclusion, however, is that of Fränkel *RhM* LVI, 34 (cf. also Hicks, *loc. cit.*): "Und zwar nötigt die Wahl dieser Mundart zu dem Schlusse, dass unter den verbundeten Staaten Athen eine führende Stelle eingenommen hat." The resolution was drafted by Athens, as the leading state, Sparta holding aloof, and copies were published elsewhere in this form.

Another question is, in assuming the existence of two or more home versions, each in its appropriate dialect, what was the form employed in those versions which, as was as often the case, were set up in the name of all parties (κοινῇ) in some center like Olympia?

---

[1] Doric forms occur in l. 18. But with l. 17 begins a new decree (cf. Fränkel *RhM* LVI, 244), and, for all that we can tell from the little that is left of these lines, this may have been wholly in Doric.

If we could have before us, as Pausanias once had, the Olympian copy of the treaty of Athens with Argos, Mantinea, and Elis, we should note its dialect with the keenest interest. Yet it would not be a test case. For, as pointed out by Kirchhoff (see above, p. 156, footnote), this copy served a double function, and if it was in the Elean dialect, as assumed by Kirchhoff, and also by Grundy *Thucydides* 55, it was solely on account of its second function as the home version of the Eleans. The copies of such common versions found at Olympia, Delos, etc., are enough to show, what might be taken for granted, that the local dialect was not substituted. But, again unfortunately, they all, like those which have been mentioned above (*passim*), pertain to parties whose dialect was the same, or had come to be the same, for most of them are comparatively late. We may conjecture that, if we had treaties between parties of different dialect in the copies which were published in their common name, they would show now the dialect of one, now of another, according to the channels through which they reached publication. But this whole matter of the dialect in treaties is the one, of all the questions which have been raised in this article, upon which more light from new discoveries is most needed.

Note to p. 142. Similar skepticism of the reading ἐποίεε is expressed in the posthumous article of the late Professor Solmsen, *Idg. Forsch.*, XXXI, 448 ff. (see p. 473, footnote), which has just reached me.